

ISSUE PAPER

IMPLEMENTATION OF CALFED'S COMPREHENSIVE MONITORING, ASSESSMENT, REPORTING AND RESEARCH PROGRAM (CMARP) FOR MONITORING ELEMENTS ASSOCIATED WITH SUCCESSFUL CATEGORY III PROPOSALS (Draft 3 - November 14, 1997)

I. ISSUE STATEMENT

One Category III requirement is that restoration and similar proposals contain monitoring elements to determine whether stated objectives have been met and to provide guidance for assessing future restoration needs. As a result, a system now needs to be established to ensure that monitoring and assessment will be successful in evaluating stated objectives and that subsequent information will be available to CALFED, agency and stakeholder resource managers. The system needs to ensure the following:

1. Monitoring, assessment and reporting plans are reviewed prior to implementation (QA/QC);
2. Data are collected using standardized methodology in a standardized format, and are stored in a common, accessible data base;
3. Information from the data is reviewed, evaluated, understood and disseminated to CALFED and agency resource managers, stakeholders and the public.

In short, a system is needed that provides for a review of monitoring elements and ensures the consistent collection, evaluation, storage and reduction of data. The system would also ensure that information developed from the data is disseminated and available for decisions related to management of the ecosystem.

A brief discussion on the relationship of this proposed monitoring system to other CALFED programs, data management needs, the establishment and use of a workgroup, the establishment and responsibilities of a chair/coordinator for this workgroup, and where we go next are discussed below.

II. RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER CALFED PROGRAMS

Monitoring was required of Category III proposals specifically to determine whether stated project objectives have been met, and more generally to provide guidance to the Category III program for future restoration needs. Information developed from Category III funded projects will also help assess the achievement of objectives listed in the Ecosystem Restoration Program Plan. In that regard, the proposed monitoring system will have to work with appropriate criteria to evaluate the achievement of project, Category

III, ERPP and CALFED objectives. This monitoring, assessment, and reporting mode is an important element of the adaptive management process.

Depending on the nature of the project, monitoring may either be long term (> 5 years) or short term (< 5 years). It is expected that short term monitoring will be project specific. Long-term monitoring may or may not be project specific and after about 5 years will probably fall under the auspices of CMARP, CALFED's long-term, comprehensive program.

III. DATA STORAGE AND MANAGEMENT

An essential element of a monitoring system is data management. Modern databases need to be able to handle a variety and quantity of biological and physical data and have these data be easily accessible to all parties through a medium such as the World Wide Web.

Such databases now exist (e.g. IEP and SFEI) and therefore it may not be necessary to develop a new one. A review and evaluation of existing databases will be conducted to determine the scope of options. It is estimated that contracting for use of an existing database will cost between \$80,000 - \$100,000 per year for data management associated with Category III projects.

IV. WORKGROUP DEVELOPMENT AND USE

It is envisioned that the main component of this monitoring system is a workgroup comprised of technical staff representing diverse disciplines from state and federal agencies and non-agency groups. To be effective, the workgroup should probably not be larger than 10-12 individuals. The workgroup would be responsible for at least the following tasks over a period of 3-5 years and longer if necessary:

- Ensure monitoring, assessment and reporting plans are technically sound and can be conducted within the budget allocated for monitoring or recommend augmentation of the budget when necessary. The workgroup should also have the responsibility to recommend combining monitoring proposals of common or related projects, and that monitoring for some projects not be conducted where appropriate.
- Ensure monitoring is conducted in a timely manner and information from the monitoring is received on a regular basis.
- Review the information developed from monitoring and prepare a report to CALFED on a regular basis addressing the achievement of objectives associated with Category III projects.

V. ESTABLISHMENT OF A WORKGROUP CHAIR/COORDINATOR

Success of the workgroup is dependent upon having a dedicated chair/coordinator. The c/c would be primarily responsible for the overall operation and efficiency of the workgroup and would be the liaison to CALFED management. The c/c could either be a CALFED consultant or an agency or stakeholder representative. Ideally, the c/c would have experience managing Category III proposals, would be familiar with Category III proposal content and process, would have a working knowledge of the pool of technical staff from agency and non-agency groups and would have excellent organizational skills. A significant amount of time would have to be dedicated to this process by the c/c to ensure its success.

It is estimated that it would cost approximately \$100,000 for a senior level dedicated chair/coordinator working approximately 9 months of the year.

VI. POSSIBLE SOURCE OF REVENUE FOR THE MONITORING PROCESS

Since the purpose of this process is to coordinate and develop reliable information from monitoring elements of successful Category III proposals, it appears reasonable that funds for development and implementation of this process come from current Category III funding sources.

VII. NEXT STEPS

Your comments on this concept paper by December 8 would be appreciated. Comments can be e-mailed directly to me at the following address: lwintem@water.ca.gov or, mailed to me at: DWR - 3251 S St. Sacramento, 95816.

It is also intended to present this proposal to the Category III Integration Panel and BDAC Ecosystem Workgroup. The purpose is to receive and incorporate comments to enable the development and implementation of a monitoring system by February 1998.

Leo Winternitz
Nov. 14, 1997